

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
5445 Corporate Drive
Troy, Michigan 48098
(248) 641-1600
Fax: (248) 641-1294

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 06 2009

fax

t r a n s m i t t a l

to:	Examiner David Rashid
fax:	(571) 273-8300
telephone:	(571) 270-1578
from:	Gregory A. Stobbs
date:	January 6, 2009
pages:	4 (including this)
re:	Application No. 10/529,316 Our Reference: 5077-000237/NP

NOTICE

The information contained in this facsimile transmission is intended only for the individual(s) to whom or entity(s) to which it is addressed. It may also contain privileged, confidential, attorney work product or trade secret information which is protected by law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the addressee, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the U.S. Postal Service. Reimbursement for any reasonable expense (including postage) for the return of the original message is ensured.

FROM :

FAX NO. :2483411074

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 06 200906 2009 03:35PM P2
Approved for use through 09/30/2008. OMB 0851-031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/529,316

First Named Applicant: Takeo Azuma

Examiner: David Rashid

Art Unit: 2624

Status of Application: Final OA issued

Tentative Participants:

(1) Timothy D. MacIntyre (Reg. No. 42,824)

(2) Phil Du

(3) Examiner David Rashid

(4)

Proposed Date of Interview: January 7, 2009

Proposed Time: 10:00 a.m. AM/PM

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) Telephonic(2) Personal(3) Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:

 YES NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) § 101 Rej.	claim 1		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) § 102/103 Rej.	claim 1	Daugman	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

 Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

See attached Proposed Amendments.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

App. No. 10/529,316
Interview Scheduled: January 7, 2009

Attorney Ref. No. 5077-0000237/NP

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 06 2009

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Regarding the rejection under 35 USC § 101, please consider the following proposed amendments.

A. "using . . . apparatus to perform the steps . . ."

B. 1. (currently amended) A counterfeit eye discrimination method comprising the steps of:
receiving image data of an image captured from a living eye or a reproduction of a living eye including an eye; and
detecting presence or absence of roughness in the image by image processing to the image data;
wherein the image eye is judged to be a counterfeit eye that is have been captured from a reproduction of a living eye when roughness is detected in the image;[I.]
performing an authentication operation in response to the judgment.

Regarding the rejections under 35 USC § 102 & 103, please consider the following proposed amendments.

C. 1. (currently amended) A counterfeit eye discrimination method comprising the steps of:
receiving image data of a photocopy image including an eye; and
detecting presence or absence of roughness in the image by image processing to the image data, wherein pixel values of the image intrinsically determines a statistical variance of the pixel values, wherein the statistical variance conclusively determines the roughness;
wherein the eye is judged to be a counterfeit eye that is a reproduction of a living eye when roughness is detected in the image.

D. We further propose to define the term "roughness" as follows:

- The roughness is on the surface of the image.
- The roughness is caused by ink or toner on a printer output.
- The roughness is of intensity data of the image.
- The roughness is caused by repetition of a specific intensity pattern on the image.

E. In contrast, Daugman at best discloses a) generating an identification iris code vector for an iris image captured and b) then comparing the identification iris code vector with reference iris code vectors in a library to calculate Hamming

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

distances, which are allegedly analogous to the claimed roughness. Daugman, col. 3, Ins. 1-36. In other words, the Hamming distances are not conclusively determined by the data of the iris image captured; the Hamming distances also depend on the reference iris codes.

Further, the above method of Daugman is to determine the identity of an iris. The iris image is presumed to be captured from a living eye. Daugman uses a different method, which monitors the pupillary diameter over time, to determine if the image is captured from a living eye or a photograph of a living eye. Daugman, col. 6, Ins. 38-61. This method takes more than one image, and thus does not determine a reproduction conclusively from the data of a single image.

F. Regarding "detecting presence or absence of roughness" in the claims, we stated in the previous response that the small-scale variation between the reference code and the present code in Daugman differs from roughness in the image. But the Examiner has presented no statement for this argument.